



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 32101-15105
SBC #460/000-05-2015
AMENDMENT # 6
FOR GOODS OR TN UTILITY DATA & ENERGY
MANAGEMENT & SOFTWARE

DATE: 10/30/2015

RFP # 32101-15105 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE
1. RFP Issued		September 23, 2015
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	September 28, 2015
3. Pre-response Conference	10:00 a.m.	September 29, 2015
4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	September 30, 2015
5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	October 6, 2015
6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		October 30, 2015
7. Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	November 16, 2015
8. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations		November 23, 2015
9. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	November 24, 2015
10. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	December 7, 2015
11. End of Open File Period		December 14, 2015
12. State sends contract to Contractor for signature		December 15, 2015
13. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	December 22, 2015

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>1 In order for the Contractor to obtain monthly billing information from utility companies/vendors that don't allow electronic access to bill data, would the State be willing to sign a Letter of Authorization for the Contractor to contact utility companies for questions, clarifications, and/or the changing of billing mailing addresses for the redirection of paper utility bills for accounts where electronic delivery is not offered?</p>	<p>Yes the State would be willing to have a signed letter of Authorization for the Contractor to contact utility companies for questions and clarifications. The letter would include authorizing the Contractor to have a duplicate bill sent to them for paper utility bills for accounts where electronic delivery is not offered, but the letter would not allow a changing of billing mailing addresses for redirection of paper utility bills. The State would remain the main recipient to receive utility bills because processing and payment of bills will still be a State function.</p>
<p>2 Does the State wish for the Contractor to handle the payment of utility invoices, or merely provide the billing data for upload into the respective Accounts Payable systems prior to the State's payment of invoices? More specifically, does the State have a preference for the Contractor to obtain the utility invoice data pre-payment vs. post-payment?</p>	<p>No, the State does not want the Contractor to handle payment of utility invoices. The Contractor is to provide the billing data for upload into the general government accounts payable system. The Contractor must obtain the utility invoice data pre-payment. A plan and proposal is required in the RFP to provide utility data upload to the UT and TBR accounts payable systems.</p>
<p>3 Does the State anticipate in-person status meetings each month (vs. teleconference) for the duration of the contract, or merely at important milestones?</p>	<p>The State expects that the Contractor will have a physical presence for regularly scheduled meetings.</p> <p>See RFP amendment section number 3 below which adds A.5.c. to the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.</p>
<p>4 How many separate training sessions does the State expect from the 100 training hours per year at each of the following locations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nashville, TN b. Knoxville, TN c. Chattanooga, TN d. Memphis, TN e. Web-based training sessions 	<p>The State expects 25 training sessions at 4hrs in length</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nashville, TN, 8 sessions b. Knoxville, TN, 4 sessions c. Chattanooga, TN, 4 sessions d. Memphis, TN, 4 sessions e. Web-based training sessions, 5 sessions <p>The State would like flexibility to make reasonable adjustments to the training schedule as the needs are more clearly identified.</p> <p>See RFP amendment section number 4 below which adds section A.5.c. to the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.</p>
<p>5 Approximately how many points/meters will be required for data collection for each of the following sources?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Real Time Interval Data from Zigbee Control Network 	<p>Part of this RFP scope is to create a plan for future integration of real-time monitoring systems. These real-time data streams should follow industry best practice.</p> <p>The cost and labor for any real-time data collection hardware including setup is not in this scope.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>b. Real Time Interval Data from Building Automation Systems</p> <p>c. Real Time Interval Data from Utility Provided Service</p>	
<p>6 Will any hardware be required for the setup/management of Real Time data collection? For example, will all of the required Building Automation System hardware already be in place, or would the cost and labor of installation be the responsibility of the Contractor?</p>	<p>See also the response to question #5.</p>
<p>7 For the cost proposal, Section 3.1.2.2 states that "the proposed cost shall incorporate ALL costs for services...". However, the proposal states elsewhere (Table 1, Page 3, terms "Varies" and "Under Development"; RFP Attachment L, meters labeled as "Unknown") that information is either undefined or unknown. How does the State intend to allow for reconciliation of these issues in the cost proposal?</p>	<p>The statements "Varies," "Under Development," and "Unknown" imply that the awarded vendor will have to be flexible in the services provided to match the need of the State when these statements do become defined during the Discovery period. The cost proposal should reflect the price of that flexibility.</p>
<p>8 Table 1, page 3, refers to systems which have been developed by others. Will there be subject matter experts available to integrate with customized systems or does that need to be included in our proposal?</p>	<p>The State would provide a subject matter expert as a resource to the Contractor on integration of the customized systems.</p>
<p>9 In section 4.4.1, the RFP restricts subcontracting without State approval. However, we may hire 3rd parties with certain integration expertise, possibly implementation, with these systems. Do these relationships need to be specified as part of the response?</p>	<p>Yes. Please include details of doing so in your proposal if you plan to use a 3rd party in your proposed solution.</p>
<p>10 Will the State provide subject matter experts, at the State's expense, for systems that are to be integrated with the proposed utility billing management system?</p>	<p>The State would provide a subject matter expert as a resource to the Contractor on integration of the customized systems.</p>
<p>11 What level of data cleanup is expected by the State for any gaps in the provided data?</p>	<p>Data cleanup strategy to fill gaps should be described by the Contractor as part of the Response. The expectation is a level acceptable to industry best practice.</p>
<p>12 What is the length of time that the State requires that the data must be retained in the system on a go forward basis?</p>	<p>The State requires that the data be maintained and accessible by the State for the contract term.</p> <p>See RFP amendment section number 5 below which</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
	adds A.3.d.ii.(I) to the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.
<p>13 1. Section A.3 of the RFP consists of 5 discrete deliverables: A.3.a through A.3.e. The RFP requires discovery across the four TN Real Estate Portfolio Groups prior to beginning execution of the recurring services (A.6)</p> <p>As an alternative, we propose to break up the state wide program into four discrete Real Estate Portfolio phases. The Phases would be as outlined below:</p> <p>Phase 1 - General Government DSG–FRF</p> <p>Phase 2 - General Government non DSG-FRF</p> <p>Phase 3 - University of TN</p> <p>Phase 4 - The Board of Regents.</p> <p>The implementation of the phases could be staggered with each phase starting 90 to 120 days after the prior phase start. All of the deliverable steps of A3.a through A3.e would still be followed for each of the phases (separate price sheets for each phase could be provided if desired).</p> <p>There are benefits to the state as well as the contractor with this approach. Instead of a massive discovery phase spanning all four real estate portfolios we would complete the discovery and baseline year identification for the first portfolio and begin loading the data into the system (A.3.c). This will allow us to show a working system much more quickly. From the contractor’s perspective, it would greatly improve the cash flow of the project.</p> <p>Is the State willing to utilize a phased approach to the project as outlined above or some other similar approach? If so, would the State also modify the payment terms to reflect the addition of phases?</p>	<p>Your proposal should follow the scope and payment methodology as given in the RFP.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>14 The A.3.a deliverables listed on page 44 are broken into 5 large payment milestones. These milestones are separated by several months resulting in limited cash flow for the contractor. We propose to further sub divide these deliverables into smaller measureable milestones that create an opportunity for more frequent billing and improved cash flow while still providing the State with measureable results. An example for A.3.c might be billing based on the number of buildings where history collection and loading has been completed for a given month rather than waiting for the history to be completed for all buildings. Will the State consider creating smaller measurable milestones?</p>	<p>See response to question #13.</p>
<p>15 The RFP outlines the project plan and schedule on page 39. Is the State willing to consider changes to the schedule such as increasing the number of days for the Assessment, Discovery and Execution plan and decreasing the time for the Baseline year identification?</p>	<p>No. The schedule table on page 39 is to define the State expectations for milestones towards project completion.</p>
<p>16 We have the questions below for the Recurring Services. The first two are for clarification and the third is payment timeline related.</p> <p>a. The pricing matrix on page 45 refers to “ongoing utility data collection fee as detailed in contract section A.4.a”. However, the referenced section deals with project schedule. There doesn’t seem to be a section in the Pro Forma Contract that clearly outlines the ongoing data collection. Can you please clarify the correct section(s) that the table references or provide a new section if one does not currently exist?</p> <p>b. The pricing matrix on page 45 refers to “SaaS Subscription fee as detailed in Section A.4.b”. However, this section deals with a risk management plan. The correct section reference appears to be A.3.d. Can you please confirm the correct section reference?</p> <p>c. We’ll be incurring costs early in the project to be ready for software</p>	<p>Response to 16.a.: The reference to “ongoing utility data collection fee” is detailed in section A.6.a.</p> <p>Response to 16.b.: The reference to “SaaS Subscription Fee” is detailed in section A.6.b.</p> <p>Response to 16.c.: Your proposal should follow the payment methodology as given in the RFP. See also response to question #13 and #15.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>platform deployment, including the transition to Edison bill payment by this system. Those costs will be include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly cloud based hosting, cloud based Microsoft Azure tools, and software configuration set up. • Integration development cost with the accounts payable system, testing, and transition to Edison • Costs associated with on-going electronic utility bill data collection • Setting up and establishing on-going weather data collection • Any other costs associated with establishing a production level system less the production level Edison functions • Project Management for the above <p>The state will be able to verify system operation, less the Edison bill payment well before the existing payment structure allows for the recurring fees to begin billing. We request that the Recurring SaaS subscription Fee be based upon 2 milestones and percentages as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin billing Sixty 60% of the SaaS subscription fee after 100 buildings have been fully implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Historical data loaded o on-going data collection has been verified to work o Baselines have been implemented o Weather data is flowing o All functionality is in place o This will demonstrate the system is fully functional less the bill payment apparatus • Increase on-going SaaS subscription fee to 100% upon completion of the bill payment function (transition as currently 	

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
described in the RFP)	
17 We are under the assumption that this is a fixed price contract for the all the deliverables, recurring system fees, and renewal periods. We have not found any language to the contrary. Is this assumption correct?	That is correct.
18 See Amendment 4 Attachment A	An estimate for the number of invoices and number of utilities can be estimated from the RFP and the attachments. The number of buildings is not known. Please see question response #5 and #6 to avoid confusion on real-time, building level monitoring.
<p>19 On page 36, section A.3.c.i the RFP states that for bills where electronic collection is not possible, the utility data shall be centralized, provided in pdf format, and a means provided for data entry.</p> <p>a. Does this section apply only to historic utility data as the heading implies or does it also apply to ongoing utility bill data collection?</p> <p>b. For non-electronic ongoing bills, please confirm that it is the State's intention to have the contractor arrange with the utility to send copies of these bills on an ongoing basis to a central location where the contractor will receive, scan to pdf, and perform data entry of the billing information.</p> <p>c. If the utility charges a fee for providing ongoing bill copies to a second address, will the State pay these fees? Will the State pay any utility fees associated with historical data?</p> <p>d. If the utility will not provide ongoing copies of the bills to a second address, will the State scan the bills to pdf and provide to the contractor for data entry or send paper copies to the central location for scanning or is there another solution desired by the State?</p>	<p>a. Applies to historic utility data including baseline year.</p> <p>b. Yes; however, this question seems to confuse Baseline Year and Historic Utility Data Collection with collection of Ongoing Utility Data; "Ongoing bills" are not part of the Historic Utility Data Collection. Please see section A.2. and A.6.a.for Ongoing Data Collection requirements. The State's intent for Baseline Year and Historic Utility Data Collection is given in section A.3.c.</p> <p>c. Yes.</p> <p>d. If the utility will not provide ongoing copies of the bill copies to a second address, the State will make arrangements to provide the Contractor with the bill. This will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
20 During this project, and in particular the discovery phases, we'll need support	The State will provide support in the capacity of utility authorizations and work with utilities to setup online

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>from the State including the areas listed below. Can you please describe how the State intends to provide support and the resources that will be utilized? Does the State intend to use dedicated staff for support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Utility Authorization forms b. Work with utilities to set up online credentials c. To identify and coordinate the appropriate State of TN personnel to facilitate gathering the data required for discovery deliverables d. Track down sample bills. While data will be gathered from utility companies if sample bills are available it will facilitate the discovery process 	<p>credentials. The State will also provide a liaison for each agency that can gather the data required for discovery deliverables and track down sample bills if they are available. The State will also provide assistance where applicable for integration into the State's current software systems.</p>
<p>21 Please confirm that the contractor is only required to implement one accounts payable integration for this project (with Edison) and that only proposals are required for the Iris and Banner systems.</p>	<p>Yes, please see A.3.a.ii.(D) and (E).</p>
<p>22 How many individuals currently input the 6,850 invoices monthly into the UM system? Does this cover all of the bill input for DGS and non-DGS Government accounts?</p>	<p>The reference in the last sentence of the paragraph under Table 1 on RFP page 3 should be to RFP Attachment P instead of RFP Attachment G.</p> <p>As noted on RFP page 3, invoicing methods vary and are not centralized between the various state organizations. The General State Government DGS-FRF facilities make up about 32% of the General State Government portfolio and about 11% of the State total real estate portfolio. The UM system is only used for data entry for General State Government DGS-FRF accounts As shown in Attachment H.</p> <p>Approximately 1100 of the 6850 utility invoices are for the General State Government DGS-FRF accounts and are entered into the UM system by two people before upload to Edison. The rest of the General State Government invoices are entered directly into Edison by each agency's accounts payable department.</p>
<p>23 Further clarification is needed regarding the extent to which acquisition of interval data from utility meters, BAS systems, etc. are part of the scope of this RFP. Sections A.3.d.ii, A.3.d.iv, and A.3.d.v.(A) seem to be in conflict with each other. One section refers to creating future plans and other refers to incorporating the data into the system.</p>	<p>RFP section A.3.d.v.(A) will be removed.</p> <p>See also response to question #5 and #6.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>Can you please clarify the requirements for ongoing interval data for this RFP? It would also be helpful to have separate sections in the agreement that clearly describe the requirements for ongoing utility bill data collection and interval data collection.</p>	
<p>24 The RFP requests a fixed fee for historical data acquisition, entry and cleanup. It's not possible to determine up-front how much of the history will be available in electronic vs paper format or how much cleanup will be required (filling gaps, etc.). This uncertainty will complicate providing a fixed fee and could result in a higher cost to the State based on the uncertainty. As an alternative, the State could ask respondents to quote a per transaction price for acquiring and entering history based on the type (electronic vs. paper, etc.). The state could also request per transaction pricing for filling gaps in the history. This approach would ensure a better apples to apples comparison between bidders since it would eliminate the variable of bidders making different assumptions. Will the State modify the pricing approach to a per transaction basis or provide the history assumptions that we should use for providing a fixed price?</p>	<p>No. Provide a fixed fee for historic utility data collection.</p>
<p>25 RFP attachment B section D – p29. Does the Respondent fill out the Technical response & evaluation guide or is this done by the State?</p>	<p>RFP attachment B section D will be filled out by the State. This is the scoring sheet used to evaluate the responses provided in attachment 1 of the <i>Pro Forma</i>.</p>
<p>26 Customization is referred to in several places in the contract including A.3.d and A.10. However, the references are open ended without any specified limits to the customization. This will make it difficult to provide a fixed price as requested. Our recommendation is that we state an assumed number of hours for customization that are included in our RFP response. If the hours for customization exceed this assumed amount it can be handled through an ASO to the agreement. Is this approach acceptable to the State?</p>	<p>No, customization of a commercially available, off-the-shelf product should be a fixed price for your Solution to provide the functionality as given in the RFP contract. Reference also Attachment 1 – Solution Checklist for Solution requirements.</p>
<p>27 Does the State have an approved budget for this project and, if so, what is budget amount?</p>	<p>Between \$2M and \$3M has been approved.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
28 Section 3.3.7 on pages 11 and 12 outlines the guidelines for sub-contracting and teaming. If the RFP response includes a Team Member that is not a sub-contractor to the prime, for what sections of the RFP must the Team Member provide separate responses?	Provide the same information for team members as for a sub-contractor.
29 Section C.8 on page 28 – please provide clarification on what this question is asking	“How will the Solution correlate historical invoice data with real-time data?”
30 Contract section A.3.a.ii.(B), page 36 – can you please clarify what you are asking for and specifically what legacy systems are you referring to?	The naming and coding convention used on this project must be consistent with the broader State of Tennessee Real Estate Asset Management program and the Office of the State Architect COBie standard. There must be clear communication with legacy systems as outlined in section 1.1.1 Background of the RFP that use other convention(s).
31 Contract section A.3.a.ii.(D), page 36 – is the State specifying that review, approval, and error correction should happen prior to upload to Edison, or after upload but prior to payment?	State review and approval of invoices, Solution error check, as well as any corrections resulting from the State review and Solution error check must happen prior to upload to Edison. Changes cannot be made after upload to Edison.
32 Contract section A.3.d.i, page 37 – states that “The SaaS shall be compatible with State information systems...” Is there a definition for compatibility with State information systems?	Compatible in terms of successful data and information transfer.
33 Contract section A.3.d.ii.(I), page 37 – can you define “confidential data” that must be encrypted “at rest”? Obviously this applies to passwords. Is any utility data considered confidential?	Confidential data includes but is not limited to login credentials, passwords and system access. The utility data is not considered confidential
34 Contract section A.3.e.iii, page 38 – can you be more specific as to other specifications?	For example, building or facility grouping by campus, agency, institution or region.
35 Contract section A.9, page 40 – In the list of documentation it appears that a – d are manuals, while e – h are subjects; are we interpreting that correctly? Is the manual organization a requirement or suggestion that can be addressed differently as long as the needs are addressed?	Yes. The Solution documentation should include but not be limited to the items in A.9.a. through h. Full Solution documentation provided by the Contractor must be provided at training
36 We are requesting an extension to the Nov 2nd deadline. The answers to the questions won't be delivered until Oct 19th, leaving us only 10 business days to complete the RFP response after	In the interest of more accurate pricing, the deadline was extended to November 16 in Amendment 1.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
receiving the answers. We request November 20th as the new deadline.	
37 Can the responses to Attachment 1 include a comments column? There are several items in the attachment that list several items where one might fully support four out of five. It seems useful to the State that we can convey that information somehow.	We will not be adding a comments column to Attachment 1 "Solution Checklist." We are keeping the "available", "available by customization," and "not available" format. If there is an item that is partially met it will be technically considered "available with custom programming."
38 Attachment J, page 47 of PDF – for UTM electric accounts, are we correct in our understanding that for each colored section, there is one utility account that feeds campus-owned sub meters as listed, and that the line items in black are direct Weakley County Electric utility accounts?	The highlighted meters are not utility owned meters. They are sub-meters read by the campus. Since these sub-meters have no associated invoice, the sub-meter readings will not be included in the historical or on-going data collection. The Solution should have the capability of accepting this type of data when automated in the future.
39 Attachment K, page 74-75 of PDF – is our understanding correct that the blue highlighted accounts here are sub meters served by a single CDE point of service? Is that also true on page 86 where the meter numbers for several of the highlighted meters look like utility company numbers, not campus-assigned numbers, or page 110-111 where meters are highlighted but include utility meter numbers and account numbers?	Please see response to question 38 for the section of the question concerning meters. The information presented in attachments J and K is all that we have at this time.
40 Attachment M, page 130 of PDF – can you please provide additional information on where and how this chart of codes is used? It does not specify what it is a template for importing into—is this level of line item detail uploaded to Edison?	Attachment M is only an example of coding and possible data fields currently in use with the General State Government DGS-FRF UM system.
41 For DGS-FRF, what role, if any, does UMS play in this project? Is it just the current utility data capture tool that is being replaced, or does the State plan for it to have a role going forward?	UMS is the current utility data capture tool used only for General State Government DGS-FRF facilities. It will be replaced. See also response for question #22.
42 Can you further define the formatting requirements for the response related to margins, headers, footers, and divider tabs, if any?	The response format is decided by the proposers. There are no official formatting requirements beyond what is required by the RFP.
43 Can the document be created in any program (Word, InDesign) as long as it is delivered in PDF format? Is there any restriction for the use of graphic elements and imagery throughout the response?	Yes, there is no restriction.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
44 For “Solution specific training services”, is the State only concerned with software training or would they like to engage in energy management specific content as well?	“Solution specific training services” is software training only.
45 How many onsite training sessions does the State want to schedule for each of the four locations (Nashville, Knoxville, Chattanooga, Memphis) per year?	See response for question #4. See RFP amendment section number 4 below which adds A.10. to the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.
46 Does the State want to include onsite training every year of the engagement or only in the first year?	Training should be available through the contract term.
47 How many webinar training sessions does the State want to schedule per year?	See response for question #4.
48 Does the State want to include training as a fixed fee or as a variable cost based on the number of hours (up to 100) and type of training (onsite vs webinar) consumed each year?	Up to 100 hours is fixed fee.
49 Section A.3.d.ii.F states “allow Management of Ongoing Utility Data on a real time basis (“Real Time Monitoring System”) and allow collection of data from the Real Time Monitoring System”. o How many data collection points are included and at how many sites? o How many additional buildings will require EnerNOC’s real-time system?	See also response for question #5 and #6. Note that there are no references to EnerNOC in this RFP.
50 • Attachment G indicates 3 sources of real-time data to the solution, ZigBee, Building Automation Systems and Utility Data. o How many buildings are being supplied with ZigBee data? o How many metered data points for ZigBee data? o How many buildings are on the ESPI Green Button protocol? o How many metered points for ESPI GB protocol? o At what interval is their data being collected on ZigBee and ESPI	See response for question #5, #6 and #49.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>systems?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Is there any API-out capability for any of the data stores? o How many buildings have Building Automation Systems? The RFP lists those within the University of Tennessee system but nothing outside of that. o Can we get a list of buildings that have BASs and what model system they are using? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Please list meter data currently being collected by all BAS systems. <input type="checkbox"/> For a given type of system, are they all centrally networked or are they discrete systems? <input type="checkbox"/> Are the BAS systems on open BACnet protocol? <input type="checkbox"/> At what interval is their meter data being collected on BAS systems? <input type="checkbox"/> Is there API out capability? o For a given type of system, what type of database is being used to store the data? Is there a central data store or does each location have its own? 	
<p>51 In order to propose the optimum overall solution, can we get a list of state buildings with the following information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Square footage o Electricity spend o Natural gas spend o Electricity usage o Gas Usage 	<p>Your proposal should be based on information provided in the RFP and attachments.</p>
<p>52 A.3.c.iv states “Real estate parameters such as gross square footage, full time equivalents, building function, etc. shall be sourced from the State’s ARCHIBUS system where available and from Higher Education’s real estate database (“Real Estate Management Software”).” Can we be more specific on the type of system? Will the State of Tennessee</p>	<p>See Table 1 on page 3 for what is known about the real estate management software.</p> <p>Note that EnerNOC is not referenced in the RFP.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
provide this information to EnerNOC and in what format?	
53 Do they have IT personnel who would work with the chosen vendor to establish integration points?	IT support will be provided for integration with current state system as referenced in the RFP. See response to questions #8, #10 and #22.
54 What is the support SLA if there are data issues with any of the existing vendors?	IT support including existing SLA support for current state systems will be provided for integration with current state system as referenced in the RFP.
55 Please explain or clarify 3.3.2 on P.11 of the RFP document.	The purpose of this language is to restrict proposers from including terms or conditions in their response that the State would be expected to adhere to. For example, a cost proposal could not include language requiring the State to pay within a certain time period. Another example would be language requiring State employees to work 60 hours a week. These are not allowed.
56 What is the deadline for the references to submit the questionnaire? Do the references send the sealed questionnaire directly to the State of TN, or to the bidder?	<p>The proposer needs to request sealed references and include those with the final RFP proposal that is submitted to the State by the response deadline as listed in the revised Schedule of Events on page 1 of this amendment.</p> <p>Please refer to RFP Attachment D on page 31:</p> <p><i>“The Respondent will be solely responsible for obtaining completed reference questionnaires as required (refer to RFP Attachment B, Technical Response & Evaluation Guide, Section B, Item B.12.), and for enclosing the sealed reference envelopes within the Respondent’s Technical Response.”</i></p>
57 In the sample contract provided in the RFP document, Paragraph A.4 outlines the State’s desired project schedule. To what extent will the State allow for project schedule changes due to issues or events beyond the Contractor’s control (e.g., unavailability of State resources)?	The state will be amenable to project schedule changes upon approval by the state. See also responses to questions #13, #15 and #16.
58 In the sample contract provided in the RFP document, Paragraph A.5 outlines the State’s meeting requirements and states that “meetings will be held at a State facility unless otherwise directed by the State.” Is the State open to, when feasible, meeting online in a webinar-type format via the GoToMeeting or similar service?	See response to question #3.
59 What are the State’s expectations for a user base for the dashboard? For	The dashboard should allow an unlimited number of users with an estimate of 800 log-in users.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
example, how many read-only users vs super-users, and what is the expected geographical / departmental breakdown?	See RFP amendment section number 10 below which adds A.3.d.iii.(A).(1) to the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.
60 The State requires historical invoice data beginning 7/1/12. How does the State expect to share this historical invoice information - will it be actual invoice images, or via a spreadsheet?	See A.3.b. and c. in RFP Attachment F, Pro Forma Contract.
61 Does the State also require historical interval data be loaded into the system? If so, how much and in what format?	There is no requirement for historical interval data.
62 Does the State of TN have a preference(s) for the method(s) of data collection and integration both for invoice and interval data?	The preference is for electronic collection using industry best practices.
63 For the real-time data portion, how many total meters and meter data points (for example, demand and usage would be two (2) data points) does the State envision collecting data from?	See response for question #5 and #6.
64 How has the State attempted to reduce energy cost/usage in the past?	This RFP is to measure and track energy cost and consumption.
65 How is the maximum liability of the State (section C.1) calculated	The maximum liability is added to the <i>pro forma</i> section C.1. after the evaluations and negotiations are completed. The cost associated with the winning proposal will be the maximum liability of the contract.
66 Will the State consider additional contract language that excludes indirect or consequential damages?	No
67 Given that this RFP is requesting a Software-as-a-Service solution on a subscription basis, would the State consider amending section D.5 (Termination for Convenience)?	No
68 Can you provide site/account information (Attachment H, for example) in Excel form for easier assessment and calculations?	Not at this time. Most attachments will be available to the winning Contractor in their original form such as Excel.
69 RFP Page 38-39 (A.4) Can the contractor propose variations to the Schedule Table deliverable dates for the listed items?	See response for question #13, #15 and #16.
70 RFP Page 39. (A6.b). The RFP states the requirement to "provide to an unlimited number of State	The contract has been updated via this amendment. Please reference section 12 and 13 of this amendment.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>users uninterrupted and continuous access to the Solution 24 hours a day, 365 days a year". Is it acceptable to have periodic, planned maintenance for software updates and patches during which users may not have access?</p>	
<p>71 RFP Page 37 A.3.d.iv</p> <p>The RFP requires a "Plan for future developments" related to the incorporation of Real Time Monitoring System and interval meters, and that "Actual consumption data from these meters shall be incorporated into the Solution by the Contractor as they are available. ". Can the State please provide an estimated number of meters currently deployed across the State? Can the State provide an estimated number of additional meters that will be added on either a monthly or yearly basis?</p>	<p>See response for question #5 and #6.</p>
<p>72 RFP Page 38. A.3.d.v (A)</p> <p>Can the State please quantify the number of Real Time Monitoring Systems (e.g. real-time/interval consumption and demand data from ZigBee based smart meter/sub meter or similar device) required to be interfaced to the Solution?</p>	<p>See response for question #5 and #6.</p>
<p>73 RFP Page 38. A.3.d.v (B)</p> <p>Can the State please quantify the number of utility audits required on a yearly or monthly basis?</p>	<p>Provide up to eighty (80) hours of field utility meter audits. Field utility meter audits consist of the Contractor field identifying and verifying multiple buildings or facilities that are served from a single Utility meter or a single building or facility served from multiple meters for the same Utility. Audit trips must be documented and preapproved by the State.</p> <p>See RFP amendment section number 9 below which removes A.3.d.v (B) from the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.</p>
<p>74 Item a. xxiv: *Electronic data collection by means of Automated Clearing House (ACH) from utilities so equipped</p> <p>In what situations would an invoice come through an Automated Clearing House (ACH) and how would it be delivered?</p>	<p>Some utility vendors such as Nashville Electric Service (NES) deliver invoices electronically through ACH. ACH may not be the best solution and is listed only for consideration.</p>
<p>75 Item b. iv: Invoice approval process with automatic notification and multiple levels of approval</p>	<p>Some State organizations may have more than one step in the invoice approval process.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
Please elaborate on what you mean by "multiple" and the intended use of this feature?	
76 General question: Manual entry and manual site setup are mentioned, however, this could lead to operator errors; why is this required and how important is this?	Manual entry and setup are not necessarily required. Comprehensive data entry that maintains data integrity as outlined in the RFP is required.
77 If the State does not have a master billing data base a. What are the common record fields from the ~250 utilities that you will want to be part of the new master data base? b. Can you please provide a high-level summary the proportion of automated invoices (e.g., EDI) versus other types of invoicing that the ~250 utilities currently employ? Are there variations of EDI interfaces?	77.a. See response to question #40. Additional record fields will be determined as part of discovery. 77.b. Not known at this time.
78 Is it the State's intent to focus first on leveraging existing smart meters that can provide interval data and integrating them into system and then over time add additional meters in the future?	See response for question #5 and #6.
79 The RFP mentions sewage, propane, coal, and steam. Does the State want metering data from these sources as part of the solution? If so, can you please describe the types of metering technologies being employed?	Meters will only be collected as practical and appropriate. See also response for question #5.
80 How many meters providing interval data does the state envision integrating into the bidder's proposed solution? Can the State provide a list of all buildings and the associated meters?	See response for question #5 and #6.
81 What percentage of State meters are able to communicate over the internet via BACnet or Modbus? Does the state want the bidders to include the costs of hardware and installation of these type of sub-metering functionality for all meters? How many meters does the State estimate would need meter upgrades?	See response for question #5 and #6.
82 What is the availability of Green Button data in Tennessee, specifically to the utilities used by the State of Tennessee for these locations?	Green Button availability is unknown.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
83 Can you provide a list of the current protocols employed by the various meters/sub-meters in use now?	Currently unknown. See also response for question #5 and #6.
84 What is the granularity of the interval data for single phase and polyphase meters that the State wants?	The State is seeking best practice, but see also response for question #5 and #6.
85 What is the interface to the ZigBee Control Network and what percentage of meters are accessible from this network?	Unknown. See also response for question #5 and #6.
86 In the sample contract provided in the RFP document, Paragraph A.5 outlines the State's meeting requirements and states that "meetings will be held at a State facility unless otherwise directed by the State." Is the State open to, when feasible, meeting online in a webinar-type format via the GoToMeeting or similar service?	See response to question #3.

3. Add the following as RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma* Contract section A.5.c. and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.5.c. The Contractor will have a physical presence for regularly scheduled meetings.

4. Add the following as RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma* Contract section A.10. and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.10. The State expects 25 training sessions at 4hrs in length
I. Nashville, TN, 8 sessions
II. Knoxville, TN, 4 sessions
III. Chattanooga, TN, 4 sessions
IV. Memphis, TN, 4 sessions
V. Web-based training sessions, 5 sessions

5. Add the following as RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma* Contract section A.3.d.ii.(I) and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.3.d.ii.
(I). store and maintain data accessible by the State for the contract term

6. Delete RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma* Contract section C.3.b. in its entirety and insert the following in its place (any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted):

C.3.b.

a. The Contractor shall be compensated based upon the following payment methodology:

A.3. Deliverables	Fees
Completion and State approval of Assessment, Discovery, and Execution Plan as detailed in	\$

Contract Section A.3.a.	
Completion and State approval of Baseline Year Identification as detailed in Contract Section A.3.b.	\$
Completion and State approval of Baseline Year Utility Data and Historic Utility Data Collection as detailed in Contract Section A.3.c.	\$
Completion and State approval of SaaS Requirements, Customizations, and Utility Dashboard as detailed in Contract Section A.3.d.	\$
Completion and State approval of Baseline Year Management Report as detailed in Contract Section A.3.e.	\$

Recurring System Fees.

A.6. Recurring Services Fees			
Item	Year 1 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Year 2 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Year 3 Date to Date Monthly Fee
SaaS Subscription Fee as detailed in Contract Section A.6.b.			
Ongoing Utility Data Collection Fee as detailed in Contract Section A.6.a.			

Item	Renewal Year 1 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 2 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 3 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 4 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 5 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 6 Date to Date Monthly Fee	Renewal Year 7 Date to Date Monthly Fee
SaaS Subscription Fee as detailed in Contract Section A.6.b.							
Ongoing Utility Data Collection Fee as detailed in Contract Section A.6.a.							

7. Add the following as RFP section A.3.c.v. and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.3.c.

- v. If the utility company will not provide ongoing copies of the bill copies to a second address, the State will make arrangements to provide the Contractor with the bill. This will be addressed on a case-by-case basis

8. Delete RFP section 1.1.1 (Background) in its entirety and insert the following in its place (any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted):

1.1.1 Background

The State seeks a Solution that will be the backbone of a statewide system to collect, correlate, and analyze the utility invoice data and real time interval data.

The Solution shall: (i) collect historic and ongoing utility invoice data from State-owned and operated facilities; and (ii) organize and analyze utility invoice data.

This Solution shall consolidate the account management and reporting of utility information to a SaaS system that allows for multiple user access. The State's buildings and facilities include structures of varying shapes and sizes, warehouses, recreational facilities, offices, parks, parking garages and parking lots, outdoor lighting areas, and emergency facilities. Many of these buildings and facilities have one or more separate utility accounts. Each utility account has several commodities including electrical, natural gas, water, sprinkler, outdoor lighting, sewer, trash, fire hydrants, etc.

The scope of work includes collaborating with real time interval data collection programs to define the parameters for real time interval data collection and integrating that real time interval data with this system (see RFP Attachment G). For the purpose of this RFP, "utility data collection" means data acquired from utility invoices including allocation through sub-meters or state-defined allocations; "real time interval data collection" means data acquired through other sources including utility interval meters, building automation systems, monitor based commissioning, fault detection & diagnostics ("FDD"), smart meters networked through the State ZigBee based network and other metering data streams. Real time reporting may have delays associated with security and network gateways.

The real estate for State of Tennessee is divided into Higher Education and General State Government both of which are defined as follows. "Higher Education" shall be all real property owned or leased by the University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Board of Regents. "General State Government" shall be all State owned or leased real property other than Higher Education. Existing systems for accounts payable and real estate management are given in the Table 1 below.

Table 1

Institution	Accounts Payable	Real Estate Management
University of Tennessee	IRIS	Varies
Tennessee Board of Regents	Banner by Elucian	In-house systems in C# and Asp.Net utilizing SQL Server
General State Government DGS-FRF	UMS data entry with upload to Oracle	Archibus under development
General State Government Non DGS-FRF	Oracle	Varies

General State Government currently processes an estimated 6,850 utility invoices each month from an estimated 208 utility providers for electricity, natural gas, propane, steam/chilled water, domestic water & sewer, and fuel oil. University of Tennessee currently processes an estimated 900 utility invoices each month from an estimated 44 utility providers. Tennessee Board of

Regents currently processes an estimated 2250 utility invoices each month from an estimated 123 utility providers. Statewide, there are an estimated 10,000 total invoices from an estimated 250 utility providers. Invoicing methods vary and are not centralized between the various state organizations. See RFP Attachment P for a diagram of the State of Tennessee real estate portfolio.

Within General State Government, the State of Tennessee, Department of General Services (“DGS”), is funded in part through a facility revolving fund (“DGS-FRF”). The ~150 owned properties and ~350 leased properties that make up the DGS-FRF portfolio total ~10.1 million square feet. This is ~11% of the total state real estate portfolio and ~32% of the total General State Government real estate portfolio. See RFP Attachment H for a list of the DGS-FRF sites and accounts.

See RFP Attachment I for account statistics for General State Government. See RFP Attachment J for utility information and a list of the University of Tennessee sites and accounts.

See RFP Attachment K for a list of the Tennessee Board of Regents sites and accounts.

See RFP Attachment L for a list of DGS-FRF facilities with known multiple meters or meters serving multiple buildings. Non-DGS-FRF General State Government buildings with multiple meters or meters serving multiple buildings are not known. RFP Attachment J for the University of Tennessee identifies single meters serving multiple buildings under the Building Name column under site list and accounts. Tennessee Board of Regents buildings with multiple meters and meters serving multiple buildings are not known.

RFP Attachments M, N, and O are examples of existing data fields for DGS-FRF data collection and energy management; debit Automated Clearing House (“ACH”); and electronic funds transfer. These data fields are provided to facilitate Respondents’ understanding of the State’s current data collection and energy management for DGS-FRF.

This Solution shall provide utility cost and consumption data statewide. Similarly, facility data relevant to energy management such as size, age, occupancy and function shall be harvested from within the State’s network. This Solution shall include data exchange with existing State systems for real estate management given in Table 1 above. The Solution shall include data upload to existing accounts payable system for General State Government.

9. Delete RFP section A.3.d.v.(A) in its entirety and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary

10. Add the following as RFP section A.3.d.iii.(A).(1) and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.3.d.iii.(A).(1). The dashboard should allow an unlimited number of users with an estimate of 800 log-in users

11. Add the following as RFP section 5.2.3 and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

5.2.3. Clarifications and Negotiations: The State reserves the right to award a contract on the basis of initial responses received, therefore, each response shall contain the Respondent’s best terms and conditions from a technical and cost standpoint. The State reserves the right to conduct clarifications or negotiations with one or more Respondents. All communications, clarifications, and negotiations shall be conducted in a manner that supports fairness in response improvement.

5.2.3.1. **Clarifications:** The State may identify areas of a response that may require further clarification or areas in which it is apparent that there may have been miscommunications or misunderstandings as to the State's specifications or requirements. The State may seek to clarify those issues identified during one or multiple clarification rounds. Each clarification sought by the State may be unique to an individual Respondent, provided that the process is conducted in a manner that supports fairness in response improvement.

5.2.3.2. **Negotiations:** The State may elect to negotiate with one or more Respondents by requesting revised responses, negotiating costs, or finalizing contract terms and conditions. The State reserves the right to conduct multiple negotiation rounds or no negotiations at all.

5.2.3.3. **Cost Negotiations:** All Respondents, selected for negotiation by the State, will be given equivalent information with respect to cost negotiations. All cost negotiations will be documented for the procurement file. Additionally, the State may conduct target pricing and other goods or services level negotiations. Target pricing may be based on considerations such as current pricing, market considerations, benchmarks, budget availability, or other methods that do not reveal individual Respondent pricing. During target price negotiations, Respondents are not obligated to reduce their pricing to target prices, but no Respondent is allowed to increase prices.

5.2.3.4. If the State determines that it is unable to successfully negotiate a contract with the apparent best evaluated Respondent, the State reserves the right to bypass the apparent best evaluated Respondent and enter into contract negotiations with the next apparent best evaluated Respondent.

12. Add the following as RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma Contract* section A.17 and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.17 **Maintenance.** System Maintenance shall include all services necessary to maintain the system operational uptime and recovery from system failures. The Contractor must be proactively monitoring the system and not relying solely on the State to notify the Contractor of system problems.
The Contractor shall include a calendar of scheduled maintenance, which shall be updated, revised, and coordinated with the State quarterly, with all scheduled activities occurring within the maintenance periods set forth herein. Contractor shall not have more than 30 minutes of scheduled maintenance per month and must provide at least three business days of notice. The Contractor shall provide for infrastructure maintenance, upgrades, and enhancements over time.

13. Add the following as RFP Attachment F *Pro Forma Contract* section A.18 and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

A.18. **Acceptable Downtime.** Following a statewide implementation, the System shall be available continuously, as measured over the course of each calendar month period, an average of 99.9% of the time, excluding unavailability as the result of Exceptions as defined below (the "Availability Percentage"). "Available" means that the System shall be available for access and use by the State. For purposes of calculating the Availability Percentage, the following are "Exceptions" to the service level requirement, and the System shall not be considered un-Available if any inaccessibility is due to: (i) regularly scheduled downtime (which shall occur only upon advance written notice during non-core business hours); or (ii) loss of the State's Internet connectivity.

14. RFP Amendment Effective Date. The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

Table 1 along with the discussion on page 3 and the associated Attachments outlines the 4 real estate divisions and the number of invoices and utilities for each.

- Can you please complete the updated Table 1 below confirming the invoices and utility accounts along with the number of sites for each? The numbers provided can be approximate.
- The University of Tennessee has 5 campuses. The invoice and utility counts were provided but can you also identify the building count per campus in the table below.
- For TBR there are 20 different individual schools, with varying number of campuses per school with an unknown building count per campus. Can you provide the building count per campus? If this is not possible then total building count for each campus?

Institution	Accounts Payable	Real Estate Management	Number Invoices	Number Utilities	Number of Buildings
University of Tennessee	IRIS	Varies	900	44	263? UTK (Knoxville) ? (UTC) (Chattanooga) ? (UTIA) Knoxville ? (UTHSC) Memphis ? (UTM) Martin
Tennessee Board of Regents	Banner by Elucian	In-house systems in C# and Asp.Net utilizing SQL Server	2250	123	?
General State Government Department General Services -RF	UMS data entry with upload to Oracle	Archibus under development	1240?	208	630?
General State Government Non DGS-FRF	Oracle	Varies	5,610?	208	?
Total	3	?	>10000	250	?